



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/744,772

01/25/2001

Roger Edwards

C005

5011

31665 7590 06/15/2006

PATENT DEPARTMENT
MACROVISION CORPORATION
2830 DE LA CRUZ BLVD.
SANTA CLARA, CA 95050

EXAMINER

MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/744,772

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS, ROGER

Examiner

Aravind K. Moorthy

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,7,8,10-14,18,19,21,25,26 and 30-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6,9,15-17,20,22-24 and 27-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 21 April 2006.
2. Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-14, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26 and 30-38 have been rejected.
4. Claims 4-6, 9, 15-17, 20, 22-24 and 27-29 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11-13, 18, 19, 26 and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schylander et al U.S. Patent No. 5,530,686.**

As to claims 1 and 12, Schylander et al discloses a method of copy protecting a digital audio compact disc (CD-DA) carrying audio data and control data [column 6, lines 1-29]. Schylander et al discloses that the control data is encoded onto the compact disc [column 5, lines 51-67]. Schylander et al discloses the copy protection method comprising rendering selected control data incorrect [column 5, lines 51-67]. Schylander et al discloses that the selected control data being ignored by an audio player, such that an audio player is able to play the audio

Art Unit: 2131

data [column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 33], whereas the incorrect data negatively effects the playability of the audio data in a data reader which is enabled to read data and process information from each sector of the compact disc, reads the incorrect, selected control data, the reading confuses the data reader which is thereby prevented from satisfactorily playing the CD-DA [column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 33].

As to claims 2 and 13, Schylander et al discloses that the control data encoded on the compact disc that has been rendered incorrect is navigation data [column 4, lines 38-44].

As to claims 7 and 18, Schylander et al discloses that the control data encoded on the compact disc defining the nature of the tracks is rendered incorrect [column 4, lines 45-55].

As to claims 8 and 19, Schylander et al discloses a method of copy protecting a digital audio compact disc (CD-DA) carrying audio data and control data, as discussed above. Schylander et al discloses that the control data is encoded onto the compact disc, as discussed above. Schylander et al discloses the copy protection method comprising rendering selected control data incorrect, as discussed above. Schylander et al discloses the selected control data being ignored by an audio player, such than an audio player is able to play the audio data, whereas the incorrect data negatively effects the playability of the audio data in a data reader which is enabled to read data and process information from each sector of the compact disc, reads the incorrect, selected control data, the reading confuses the data reader which is thereby prevented from satisfactorily playing the CD-DA, as discussed above. Schylander et al discloses that the control data encoded on the compact disc defining the nature of the tracks is also rendered incorrect [column 4, lines 45-55].

As to claims 11 and 26, Schylander et al discloses that the control data encoded on the compact disc is altered, to render it incorrect, prior to mastering of the disc [column 4, lines 37-44].

As to claims 31, 33, 35 and 37, Schylander et al discloses that the incorrect control data negatively effects the playability of the audio data in a conventional data reader [column 7, lines 19-50].

As to claims 32, 34, 36 and 38, Schylander et al discloses that the data reader cannot play any of the audio data carried on the compact disc [column 7, lines 19-50].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3, 10, 14, 21, 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schylander et al U.S. Patent No. 5,530,686 as applied to claims 1, 8, 12 and 19 above, and further in view of Maeda et al U.S. Patent No. 5,153,861.

As to claims 3, 10, 14, 21, 25 and 30, Schylander et al discloses that the data is rendered incorrect, as discussed above.

Schylander et al does not teach that the data is provided in the lead-in and identifies the position on the disc of the lead-out.

Art Unit: 2131

Maeda's invention teaches a recording/reproducing device where additional information concerning reproducing procedures, etc. edited by the user is recorded in the lead-in region on a recording medium [column 2 line 40-49]. The TOC (table of contents) is formed in the lead-in region [column 4 lines 10-14]. The TOC contents contains the start and end position of each track.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schylander et al so that lead-in region would contain the invalid symbols and would identify the position of the lead-out. The examiner asserts that the end of the last track is going identify the position of the lead-out.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schylander et al by the teaching of Maeda because it saves the user the conventional trouble of entering procedures for reproduction, etc. every time he/she places the recording medium in the recording/reproducing device, thereby resulting in an enhanced operability, column 3 lines 33-43.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 4-6, 9, 15-17, 20, 22-24 and 27-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claims 4 and 15, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the control data in the Lead-In that indicates the Atime at the start of the Lead-Out is rendered incorrect.

As to claims 5 and 16, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the control data in the Lead-in shows the Atime at the start of the Lead-Out to be zero.

As to claims 6 and 17, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the control data in the Lead-In has a value for the Atime at the start of the Lead-Out that occurs during a first audio track on the compact disc.

As to claims 9, 20, 24 and 29, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the data on the CD identifying the nature of the tracks incorrectly identifies each audio track as a data track.

As to claims 22 and 27, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the control data encoded on the compact disc that has been rendered incorrect is timing data.

As to claims 23 and 28, prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest that the control data encoded on the compact disc that has been rendered incorrect is navigation and timing data.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aravind K Moorthy 
June 9, 2006

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

 6/11/06